REMARKS

Reconsideration of the above-identified Application is respectfully requested. Claims 1-20 are in the case. Claims 1 and 11 have been amended.

Regarding the rejection of Claims 1, 2, 4, 7, 9-12, 14, 17, 19 and 20 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Smith et al. in view of Ogasawara, Claims 1 and 11 have been amended to overcome the rejection. Independent Claim 1 recites a current limiting circuit wherein a control circuit monitors a voltage across a switch, connected between a power supply and a load, and a voltage across a shunt resistor connected to the switch, and limits the current through the switch *to a predetermined maximum current* as determined by the voltage across the shunt resistor and the voltage across the switch. This novel arrangement provides for limiting current flow to a predetermined maximum through the switch in an overvoltage condition, thus avoiding damage to circuitry, and does so without requiring a sense resistor in the power conduction path, while at the same time providing programmability by one resistor external to the control circuit. It is respectfully submitted that the limitation added to Claim 1 is consistent with the observations and suggestion of the Examiner in the above-identified Office Action regarding what was argued but not claimed in the previous Amendment. Specifically, it is not clear that the claimed control circuit limits the current through the switch to a predetermined maximum current as determined by the voltage across a shunt resistor and the voltage across the switch, unlike what is disclosed in either Smith et al. or Ogasawara. Therefore, it is respectfully submitted that Claim 1 is allowable over Smith et al., Ogasawara, and, indeed, all of the art of record whether considered alone or in any combination.

Independent Claim 11 recites a current limiting circuit wherein a control circuit monitors a voltage across a switch, connected between a power supply and a load, and a voltage across a shunt resistor connected to the switch, and limits the current through the switch to a predetermined maximum current set by

the shunt resistance. Thus, the arguments as those set forth above for the allowability of Claim 1 apply as well to Claim 11, and therefore those arguments are incorporated here as if set forth in their entirety. Therefore, it is respectfully submitted that Claim 11 is allowable over Smith et al., Ogasawara, and, indeed, all of the art of record whether considered alone or in any combination.

The other claims under this rejection, Claims 2, 4, 7, 12, 14 and 17, all depend from Claim 1 or Claim 11, and so for the reasons set forth above are allowable as well, as well as for the additional limitations found therein.

Wherefore, reconsideration and withdrawal of this rejection are respectfully requested.

Regarding the rejection of Claims 3 and 13 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Smith et al. in view of Ogasawara and *In re Japikse*, this rejection is respectfully traversed. Claim 3 depends from Claim 1 nad Claim 13 depends from Claim 11. The reasons for the allowability of Claim 1 and Claim 11 over Smith et al. and Ogasawara are set forth above, and thus apply as well to these claims. Therefore, those arguments are incorporated here as if set forth in their entirety. The court decision *In re Japikse* fails to cure the deficiencies of Smith et al. and Ogasawara. It was merely cited for the proposition that rearranging parts of an invention involves only routine skill, and does not disclose relevant art.

Therefore, it is respectfully submitted that Claims 3 and 13 are allowable over Smith et al., Ogasawara, *In re Japikse*, and, indeed, all of the art of record whether considered alone or in any combination. Wherefore, reconsideration and withdrawal of this rejection are respectfully requested.

Regarding the rejection of Claims 3, 5, 6, 8, 13, 15, 16, and 18 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Smith et al. in view of Ogasawara and A. Sedra et al., this rejection is respectfully traversed. Claims 3, 5, 6 and 8 all depend, either directly or indirectly, from Claim 1. Claims 13, 15, 16 and 18 all depend, either directly or indirectly, from Claim 11. The reasons

for the allowability of Claim 1 and Claim 11 over Smith et al. and Ogasawara are set forth above, and thus apply as well to these claims. Therefore, those arguments are incorporated here as if set forth in their entirety. The article to Sedra et al. fails to cure the deficiencies of Smith et al. and Ogasawara. Sedra et al. was merely cited for the proposition that P-channel and N-channel MOSFETs are mutually replaceable with some minor circuit adjustment, and does not relate to the control circuit feature of Claim 1 nor to the control circuit feature of Claim 11.

Therefore, it is respectfully submitted that Claims 3, 5, 6, 8, 13, 15, 16, and 18 are allowable over Smith et al., Ogasawara, A. Sedra et al., and, indeed, all of the art of record whether considered alone or in any combination. Wherefore, reconsideration and withdrawal of this rejection are respectfully requested.

It is respectfully submitted that the claims recite the patentably distinguishing features of the invention and that, taken together with the above remarks, the present application is now in proper form for allowance. Reconsideration of the application, as amended, and allowance of the claims are requested at an early date.

While it is believed that the instant amendment places the application in condition for allowance, should the Examiner have any further comments or suggestions, it is respectfully requested that the Examiner contact the undersigned in order to expeditiously resolve any outstanding issues.

To the extent necessary, the Applicants petition for an Extension of Time under 37 C.F.R. §1.136. Please charge any fees in connection with the filing of this paper, including extension of time fees to the Deposit Account No. 20-0668

of Texas Instruments Incorporated.

Respectfully submitted,

J. Dennis Moore
Attorney for Applicant(s)
Reg. No. 28,885

Texas Instruments Incorporated
P.O. Box 655474, MS 3999
Dallas, TX 75265
Phone: (972) 917-5646
Fax: (972) 917-4418